

the Federal budget deficit. Very interesting.

Let me relate, as I have in the past, something that happened over 9 years ago to describe the importance of this subject. On 9/11/2001, this country was attacked. One month later, October 11, 2001, there was a report by a CIA agent code named Dragonfire. One of our agents had a report that said there was a nuclear weapon smuggled into New York, a 10-kiloton Russian nuclear weapon stolen and smuggled into New York by terrorists to be detonated. That was 1 month to the day after 9/11. That report from the CIA agent caused apoplexy among the entire national security community. It was not public at that point. It was not made public.

After about a month, they decided that it was perhaps not a credible piece of intelligence. But when they did the post mortem, they discovered that clearly someone could have stolen a Russian nuclear weapon, perhaps a 10-kiloton weapon, and could have smuggled it into New York City. A terrorist group could have detonated it, and a couple hundred thousand people could have perished—one stolen nuclear weapon. There are 25,000 of them on the planet—25,000.

The question is, Do these agreements matter? Do they make a difference? Of course, they do. The fact is, nuclear arms agreements have made a very big difference.

I have had in the drawer of my desk for a long period a couple of things I would like unanimous consent to show.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. This is a piece of metal from a Soviet Backfire bomber. We didn't shoot this bomber down. It was sawed off. They sawed the wings off this bomber. They did it because we paid for it under the Nunn-Lugar agreement in which we have actually reduced nuclear weapons, both delivery vehicles and nuclear weapons.

So I have in my desk a piece of a Soviet bomber that had its wings sheared off because of a US-Russian agreement, and that delivery system is gone. I have a hinge that was on a silo in Ukraine for a missile that had on it a nuclear weapon aimed at this country. Well, that missile is now gone. I have the hinge in my hand. That missile that held a nuclear warhead aimed at America is gone. In its place on that field are sunflowers—sunflowers—not missiles.

I have in this desk as well some copper wire that was ground up from a Soviet submarine that was dismantled as a result of a US-Russian arms control agreement. These agreements work. We know they work. We have reduced the number of delivery vehicles; yes, submarines, bombers, missiles. We have reduced the number of nuclear weapons. This agreement will further reduce the number of nuclear weapons.

Now, if it is not the responsibility of our country to begin addressing the

ability to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and to reduce the number of nuclear weapons on the face of this Earth, then whose responsibility is it? It is clearly our responsibility to shoulder that leadership. One important element of that is when we negotiate these kinds of treaties, arms reduction treaties, that virtually everyone—Republicans and Democrats who know anything at all about national security and about arms reduction agreements—has said makes sense for our country, when we do that, it seems to me we ought not have the same old thing on the floor of the Senate, and this ought not be a part of gridlock.

This is a negotiation between our country and Russia with respect to reducing delivery vehicles and reducing nuclear weapons. The National Security Working Group, of which I was a member—and a number of my colleagues were members—met in this Capitol Building, and we were briefed and briefed and briefed again by those who were negotiating this treaty. This is not a surprise. There is nothing surprising here. In my judgment, this Senate should, in this month, do what is necessary to have the debate and ratify this treaty.

Again, let my say, this President sent to the Congress a budget request that had ample and robust funding, with a 10-percent increase for modernization and life extension programs for our nuclear weapons. I know that because I chaired the committee that put in the money at the President's request.

Then, because of those who believed you had to have the extra money for the nuclear weapons program, that money was put in a continuing resolution so that program goes ahead with a 10-percent increase, while the rest of the Federal Government goes on at last year's level. I did not object to that. But I do object when they say there is not ample funding here—a 10-percent increase this year, a 10-percent increase next year. Testimony by everyone who knows about these weapons programs, the cost of them and the effectiveness of these treaties, ought to be demonstration enough for us to do our job and to do our job right.

We have a lot of important issues in front of us. I understand that. But all of these issues will pale by comparison if we do not find a way to get our arms around this question of stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and reducing the number of nuclear weapons. If one, God forbid—one nuclear weapon is exploded in a city on this planet, life on this planet will change.

So the question of whether we assume the responsibility of leadership—whether we are willing to assume that responsibility—will determine in large part, it seems to me, about our future and about whether we will have a world in which we systematically and consistently reduce the number of nuclear weapons and therefore reduce the threat of nuclear weapons in the future.

I do hope my colleagues—and, by the way, I do not suggest they are operating in bad faith at all. But some of my colleagues have insisted—insisted—there is not enough funding. It is just not the case. The demonstration is clear. It is the one area that has had consistent, robust increases in funding, requested by this President, and complied with by this Congress, and now even advance funding through the continuing resolution. It seems to me it is time to take yes for an answer on the question of funding, and let's move ahead and debate this treaty and do what this country has a responsibility to do: ratify this treaty, and do it soon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

FDA FOOD SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 510, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 510) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the safety of the food supply.

Pending:

Reid (for Harkin) amendment No. 4715, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, I do not see Senator BAUCUS in the Chamber, so I will go ahead and get started. My understanding is we will be going back and forth. So I will finish my opening remarks, and then if he arrives I will yield to him.

In just a few hours Senators are going to have a distinct choice. Two amendments will be offered to repeal what I think we have all come to regard as a very nonsensical tax paperwork mandate that was included in the health care reform bill.

There is broad agreement the 1099 repeal is necessary to remove Federal roadblocks to job creation. But today we have a choice on the two amendments. Today's choice comes down to what I regard as a very straightforward choice, a choice relative to fiscal responsibility, and it is illustrated by the chart I have in the Chamber.

My amendment fully offsets the cost of the 1099 repeal. The alternative Baucus amendment piles \$19 billion of debt onto the backs of future generations. The irony of this is just unmistakable. On one hand, we have a provision in the health care law that we have all come to regard as crazy, foolishness. Even the President has said it does not make any sense—or words to that effect.

On one hand, to repeal it, we are adding to the debt of future generations.